



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

fatherland more respected abroad than it had been since the reign of Charles V. The tendency of the Old World is slowly, but steadily, towards democratic forms of government. Many years may yet elapse before the Continental nations will find themselves in full enjoyment of all the rights of men. But when the last vestige of rule by divine right shall be swept away, they will perhaps praise Count Bismarck as the practical revolutionist, who, by laying violent hands upon the anointed of the Lord, expedited not a little the final collapse of monarchy.

H. VILLARD.

---

ART. VIII. — THE REVOLUTION IN ENGLAND.

WE adopt the title of our article, not as a sensation heading, but because a considerable amount of revolutionary sentiment has been developed by recent events in England, and the country appears at length to be on the eve of really organic change. Foreigners revisiting it after an interval of a few years are greatly impressed by this fact. "At last the French Revolution has reached you," was the exclamation of an American, who had been moving in English political circles, to an English friend. It will not be a French, but an English revolution; for the political temperament of the people as a whole is little changed, and the movement is likely still to be slow. But questions are being freely and practically discussed on which a few years ago the lips of Englishmen were sealed; institutions are challenged which a few years ago were sacred; and the nation, we repeat, appears at length to be on the eve of organic change.

The early part of the administration of William Pitt was a period of political progress, though not of organic change. Pitt himself, raised to power originally by the personal favor of the King, was nevertheless by inclination Liberal, not only on economical questions, with regard to which he was the first to put in practice the doctrines of Adam Smith, but with regard to diplomacy and politics; and he appears to have seen with sym-

pathy the earlier portion of the French Revolution, the overthrow of French despotism, and the inauguration of constitutional monarchy in its place. But the excesses of the Revolution produced a violent reaction in England, as well as in other European countries; and the long war, first with the French Republic, and afterwards with Napoleon, not only entirely suspended the cause of political progress, but gave the Tories, as the reactionary party, a power which they retained for some years after the war had closed. Gradually, however, the nation regained its balance, and political progress recommenced. The foreign policy of England grew more liberal; by degrees she detached herself from the despots of the Holy Alliance, who, having been replaced on their thrones by nations welcoming them as liberators from the military tyranny of the French Emperor, had speedily laid aside the popular character with which the War of Independence had for a moment invested them, and formed a conspiracy for the suppression of liberty in Europe. This diplomatic reaction towards the side of Liberalism culminated in the short, but brilliant, ministry of Canning, formerly a lieutenant of Pitt, the author of the "Anti-Jacobin," and during the earlier part of his political life a Tory of the Tories,—who, to balance and counteract the encroachments of despotism in Europe, which he had not the power to avert, helped into existence the South American republics.

Meantime, however, Liberalism had been making progress in home policy. The great reforms in the criminal law proposed by Romilly and Mackintosh had been taken up and carried into legislative effect by Sir Robert Peel, who, though a Tory on organic questions, was always an administrative reformer. Free trade, the sister of political Liberalism, had found successful advocates in Mr. Huskisson and the other members of what was called the party of the Economists. But above all, the cause of civil and religious liberty had made great strides in connection with the struggle for Catholic emancipation. In that struggle not a few of the more open-minded Tories, with Canning at their head, appeared as champions of emancipation, though a good deal perhaps under the influence of a sentimental feeling in favor of the old Catholic nobility,

and without knowing how much was involved in the object for which they contended, or how wide was the application of the principles which they propounded.

In the cabinet of Lord Liverpool Catholic Emancipation was an open question, one half of the ministers being for, the other half against, the measure; and the two sections, whose divergences of sentiment really extended beyond that particular issue, being precariously bound together by the presidency of the venerable mediocrity who had been fortunate enough to be Prime Minister at the time of the final victory over Napoleon. The death of Lord Liverpool was followed by a disruption. The personal brilliancy of Canning, and the growing strength of the party of Catholic emancipation, of which he was the chief, enabled him to thrust aside the section headed by the Duke of Wellington, to which Eldon and the other Tories of the old school belonged, and to form a semi-liberal government, — a government liberal in foreign and economical policy, though its chief remained to the end of his life the obstinate opponent of parliamentary reform.

The sudden death of Canning threw the government back into the hands of the Duke of Wellington, or, rather, into those of the Duke's nominal subordinate, but real master, Sir Robert Peel. A practical statesman and administrator of the highest class, Sir Robert Peel strove to avert the necessity for organic change by the most vigorous administrative reforms, by the abolition of sinecure places, by the reduction of the army and navy, and by the general diminution of expenditure, — a policy which he carried to such an extent that his ministry is still regarded as the golden age by economical reformers, and frequently points the moral of public frugality in the economical speeches of Mr. Bright. The current, however, was too strong to be thus diverted from its course. Wellington and Peel were compelled by the imminent danger of civil convulsions to bring forward and carry a measure of Catholic emancipation. But though by this concession they settled one great and perilous question, and with credit to themselves, (for the perfect frankness and manliness with which they avowed their change of policy and its motives more than preserved their character as public men,) they found themselves on the morrow of that

settlement face to face with the still greater and still more perilous question of parliamentary reform. The rotten borough system, under which the decayed relics of mediæval towns, and petty Cornish villages enfranchised by unconstitutional sovereigns, returned members, while the great cities, recently created by the development of trade and manufactures, returned none, under which the sale and purchase of seats in the House of Commons went on as openly and shamelessly as the traffic in any article of commerce, and which had reduced the representation of the people almost to a nullity in England, and quite to a nullity in Scotland, was too shocking to common sense to be endured any longer, even by the nation which is most patient of theoretical imperfections and most easily deluded by the semblance of practical utility. The Whig section of the aristocracy, expelled by George III. and Pitt from the monopoly of power and of the great offices of state, which they had enjoyed almost without interruption from the accession of the House of Hanover, had learnt popular principles in adversity, and now placed themselves decisively at the head of the reform movement. The progress of the Liberal party in France, which ended in the dethronement of Charles X., lent an impulse to Liberalism in England. Wellington and Peel, unable to stem the increasing force of the torrent, and too deeply pledged against reform to think of any concession which would have satisfied the nation, fell from power, nominally on a secondary question connected with the civil service estimates, really on the question of parliamentary reform.

The only doubt in the minds of Wellington, Eldon, Croker, and other Tories of the antiquated school with regard to the Reform Bill of 1832 was, whether a democratic anarchy would ensue at once, or whether its advent would be deferred for a few years. So entirely destitute were their intellects of the very conception of a people which, rendered loyal to national institutions by their equity and beneficence, might be a law to itself; so absolutely, in their ideas, was government a matter of force, and the retention of government, legally or practically, in a few hands essential to its effectiveness, and even to its existence. Yet the Reform Bill of 1832 enfranchised less

than one sixth of the adult male population of the country. It withheld the vote almost entirely from the laborers and artisans by whose toil the wealth and greatness of England were sustained, and the estates of the nobility were being rapidly doubled and quadrupled in value while their owners slept. The class which it mainly enfranchised was the middle class, a class essentially conservative in temperament on political questions, though generally opposed to the State Church in religion, standing, to a great extent, to the upper class in the relation of tradesman to customer, and apt, in consequence of that relation, to be not only not antagonistic, but subservient to wealth. Moreover, the distribution of seats was still such as most materially to detract from the popular character of the representation in the new House of Commons. Though the rotten boroughs, in the strict sense of the term, were abolished, little regard was had, in the distribution of seats, to the ratio of population, — towns scarcely above the rank of villages returning a number of members equal to that conferred on vast cities or populous counties; so that a majority of the House of Commons was still elected by a mere fraction of the community, and, as such a fraction is sure to be amenable to pressure and manipulation, the keys of power were still left in the hands of the aristocratic and plutocratic class.

Sir Robert Peel, the struggle once over, had the wisdom frankly to accept the new order of things, and to train his party in the art of holding by the influence of position and wealth the power which they had before held by the possession of the rotten boroughs. He discarded the name Tory with its reactionary and odious associations, adopted in its place the name Conservative, and taught his followers under that title to adapt their policy to the existing sentiments of England and of Europe. He took up a friendly position towards the Non-Conformists, studied with especial care the interests of the trading part of the community, and cultivated the good-will of literature, science, and the public press. Sprung from the middle class, (for his father, the first Sir Robert Peel, had been a cotton-spinner,) he was peculiarly qualified, not only by association, but by character and temperament, to conciliate the class from which he had risen, and which under the Reform

Bill had come into political power. He was, in fact, the English counterpart of the *bourgeois* King of France. Though destitute of the brilliant qualities to which the name of genius is commonly confined, seldom rising in his oratory above the level of a good business speaker, occasionally betraying positive want of insight on organic questions, and hampered to the end of his career by the fatal associations of his high Tory youth, Peel played a very remarkable part in political history. His practical ability, his integrity, his vast experience and knowledge of the public business, his personal ascendancy in the House of Commons, his special acquaintance with the commercial interests of the country, the union, in him perfectly spontaneous and sincere, of attachment to monarchical and aristocratic institutions with warm popular sympathies and a comprehensive regard for the interests of the whole nation, gave Conservatism a strong hold on popular as well as on aristocratic opinion, not in England only, but in the other countries of Europe. He was the trusted counsellor of the other conservative governments, especially of the government of Louis Philippe, and the advice he gave them was inspired not only by a politic moderation, but by a sincere desire of reconciling the nations with their rulers, and of founding the order of things to which he clung not only on the allegiance, but on the affection of the people.

The memorable administration of Sir Robert Peel (1841–1846) seemed almost to secure the permanent ascendancy of his party. Its fall is commonly ascribed to the repeal of the Corn Laws, which was rendered inevitable by the sufferings of the English people under the system of protection, by the growing influence of the Anti-Corn-Law League, and by the Irish famine of 1846. This impression, however, is only partly correct. It is true that the overthrow of the Peel government was rendered possible by the exasperation of the protectionist land-owners, who formed a large proportion of the Conservative party, and who were frantic with fear of a great fall in the value of their estates: an apprehension which was very natural at the time, though experience has since shown it to have been unfounded,—the influence of increased national prosperity having so completely counteracted the loss of the monopoly, that

the value of land, instead of falling, has risen greatly. But this exasperation would probably have subsided, at all events it would not have assumed the form of permanent disruption, had not advantage been taken of it for the purpose of effecting a revolution in the leadership of the party by Mr. Disraeli, who was always a Free-Trader, as he now avers, and by Lord Derby, who was remarkable for his patrician ignorance of all economical subjects, and was ready to throw over protection as soon as the immediate object had been attained. Lord Derby, a high aristocrat, and, from his brilliant, though somewhat superficial qualities, the idol of his caste, had never been able to reconcile it with the due order of Nature that he should remain in a subordinate position, and, before the repeal of the Corn Laws was proposed, there had been some symptoms of his alienation from his leader, and of the gathering of disaffection of which he was the nucleus. Mr. Disraeli had been left out of the ministry by Sir Robert Peel, and through two preceding sessions had been assailing the minister with the most vindictive and personal bitterness. By the action of these two men, who were soon afterwards found in avowed alliance, the revolution was effected. Peel was ejected from the leadership, and Lord Derby became the head of the party, with Mr. Disraeli as his lieutenant in the House of Commons. But the singular union which high society worships in Lord Derby, of oratorical facility with sporting tastes and enough of classical learning and literary power to produce a very meritorious translation of Homer, did not make him a statesman, or give him any firm hold on the confidence of the country. From the time when he leaped into the seat of Sir Robert Peel, the Conservative, or, as it now began again to call itself, the Tory party, suffered twenty years of exclusion from power, broken only by two brief interludes of office, both without a majority in the House of Commons and therefore without real control over legislation, both purchased by sacrifices of principle, both ignominious, and both disastrous. When Nature has determined that an aristocracy shall die, she raises up a Lord Derby as the minister of Fate.

But though the Conservative party was excluded from office by the want of powerful leaders, the temper of the nation



during the years 1846–1866 was decidedly Conservative. It at once repelled the European revolution (if that can be called a revolution which proved to be little more than a contagious revolt) of 1848. Trade was, with brief intermissions, very prosperous; riches increased, and the nation set its heart upon them; a cynical indifference to moral and political objects pervaded not only the upper, but the middle class; on every side appeared the characteristics at once of a money-loving and a pleasure-seeking people. The only progress was in the action of the intellectual forces which were silently sapping the foundations of the state religion. Lord Palmerston, for ten years dictator of England, was nominally a Liberal, and the leader of the Liberal party; really he was a Conservative, and he governed the country, as premier, on Conservative principles. He closely resembled in character and opinions the Voltairean aristocrats of France before the Revolution, and his historic prototype might have been found in Choiseul. In morals he was understood to be liberal and something more; as to religion, he would probably have burnt incense to Jupiter, had that deity happened to be enshrined in Westminster Abbey, as readily as he conferred bishoprics on leading Evangelical clergymen to secure the great Evangelical vote; and his antipathy to Russia gave a certain air of Liberalism to his foreign policy, though the Liberal cause in Europe never received from him any practical assistance. But in his home policy he was above all things an aristocrat, and an enemy to organic change. His personal qualities and political tendencies rendered him the cynosure of a class of men very numerous and influential in England,—men who have made great fortunes as merchants or manufacturers, and, having done so, desire to mingle with the aristocracy, and often exceed the old aristocracy themselves in their oligarchical spirit and their estrangement from the people. These men thronged the brilliant salons of Cambridge House in company with Liberal journalists, whom the insinuating premier, like another Orpheus, had charmed out of their savage independence, and turned into the most domestic of all his political allies.

Lord Russell, while yet at the head of the Liberal party, before he had been supplanted by Lord Palmerston, had proposed a

measure of parliamentary reform embodying a further extension of the franchise, with a view to the admission to political rights of a portion of the working class. In this, whatever may have been his motives, (and they were probably the mixed motives of a party leader under a system of party government,) he was faithful to the traditions of his youth ; for he had been chosen, though a very young man and not in the cabinet, by the Whig ministry in 1832 to move their Reform Bill in the House of Commons. Having been proposed by the leader, parliamentary reform became an article in the formal creed of the Liberal party. Wealthy men, seeking a seat in Parliament for social rather than political objects, and presenting themselves as candidates for the suffrage of boroughs traditionally Liberal, declared themselves in their addresses, as a matter of course, favorable to an extension of the suffrage. But Lord Palmerston found a way to relieve them from the unwelcome necessity of giving practical effect to their pledges in the House of Commons, and he owed no small portion of his upper-class popularity to the conviction, that, while he ruled, the political conscience of the party would never be awakened out of its comfortable sleep. Nor were the constituencies themselves extreme to mark the want of reforming zeal in their representatives ; for, as we have already said, the reaction extended not only through the upper, but through a great part of the middle class. Lord Russell was allowed, under the leadership of Lord Palmerston, again to bring forward a measure of parliamentary reform ; but the measure was doomed from its birth, and was quietly stifled amidst the acquiescence of all but the most decidedly Liberal section of the House, whose numbers in those days would have been easily counted. Even the moderate motion of Mr. Locke King, to extend the franchise in the counties to occupants of houses paying ten pounds' rent, was lost without a serious struggle, Lord Palmerston paying a nominal tribute to his ostensible principles by voting for it, but speaking so as to secure its rejection. A subordinate member of the Palmerston government, having afterwards come out as the most vehement opponent of Mr. Gladstone's Reform Bill, was taxed with having previously voted for a measure of the same kind. The defence

set up for him by his friend was, that he had voted in the conviction that the measure would not be allowed to pass. The result of such a *régime* was not only the suspension of Liberal legislation, but the thorough demoralization of the Liberal party.

The state of political feeling among the upper and middle classes in England was signally illustrated by the conduct of those classes with reference to the civil war in this country. But from that event dates a change. When, to the astonishment of all believers in the London "Times," the bubble of democracy did not burst, and the bubble of oligarchy did, a recoil of sentiment was certain to ensue. The failure of all the predictions, as confident as they were charitable, of anarchy, military despotism, repudiation, confirmed the impression which the victory of the Federal arms had made. The Tories have now slipped over to the winning side; and the colleagues of Lord Cairns, the men who cheered on Mr. Laird, and whose organs in the press met American remonstrance with defiance and redoubled insult, are now eagerly claiming credit for the adoption of a conciliatory policy towards the United States, overwhelming Mr. Reverdy Johnson with caresses, and boasting to the constituencies that they have settled the question of the Alabama. But in the hour of delirious triumph over the supposed fall of the Republic they had unmasked before their own people; and though American diplomacy accepts the overtures of Lord Stanley and his colleagues, before the English people the mask cannot be resumed. The artisans, who to a man were true to the Republic under the most trying circumstances, found themselves placed, on a great moral question, in a position of distinct superiority to the ruling class, and saw their own moral perceptions justified against upper-class education and intelligence in the practical result. Moreover, deserted by the great mass of the politicians and the men of local influence, they were led to seek new leaders among the men of intellect: a conjunction which Cobden noted at the time as one of great significance for the future.

On the death of Lord Palmerston, Lord Russell having again become leader of the Liberal party and head of the government, he and Mr. Gladstone at once took up in earnest the question of parliamentary reform. They brought forward a

measure limited in its scope, and falling short of the wishes of the Radical party, but intended to enfranchise the more intelligent and independent of the working class. The introduction of a *bona fide* Reform Bill, however, at once revealed the condition in which Lord Palmerston had left the Liberal party in the House of Commons. By far the greater portion of the party was immediately seen to be false at heart to its principles and its pledges, and rotten to the core. A large section, headed by Lord Grosvenor, the heir of the enormously wealthy Marquis of Westminster, and by Mr. Lowe, at once passed over to the enemy, and labored in concert with Mr. Disraeli to defeat the bill. But the numbers of this section, on which Mr. Bright fixed the nickname of the Cave of Adullam, were an inadequate measure of the real amount of treachery and defection in the Liberal ranks. The bill was thrown out. Lord Russell and Mr. Gladstone proved their sincerity by resignation; and the Conservatives and Adullamites exulted openly, while a large number of professing Liberals, especially of the wealthier class, exulted secretly, but not the less fervently, over the indefinite postponement of parliamentary reform.

The Liberal party in the country, however, was sounder than in the House of Commons. It had not undergone the personal influence of Lord Palmerston, and it of course included multitudes uncorrupted by high society or wealth. The insulting language held by Mr. Lowe and other violent reactionists in Parliament had stung the working class to the quick. "We will set our heel on democracy," said an Adullamite nobleman. They had done so in too literal a sense. The character of Mr. Gladstone, his eloquence, his purity, the remembrance of the benefits which as a financial and economical legislator he had conferred on the working classes, indignation against the perfidy by which he had fallen, moved the hearts of the artisans. The group of literary men, who, with Mr. Mill at their head, had become connected with the popular cause on the American question, continued to uphold it on the question of parliamentary reform, and used their knowledge of political philosophy and history to set forth in articles, pamphlets, and volumes the benefits which would result from the substitution of a national government for the government of a class. Reform

leagues and unions were organized ; Mr. Bright addressed a series of great public meetings ; and parliamentary reform became a serious question.

It is probable, nevertheless, that the extension of the suffrage might have been put off for a considerable time, had the Conservative leaders possessed the strength of conviction and the courage to stand to the principles which they had so solemnly avowed. Though the artisans of the North were excited and zealous, general apathy still reigned in England south of the Trent. Mr. Bright affirmed, and no doubt believed, that he was at the head of a great force ; but multitudes would flock to hear Mr. Bright, and be worked up by his eloquence to momentary enthusiasm, on whom no reliance could have been placed in a hard and protracted struggle against wealth and power. The opponents of reform were in a great majority in the existing House of Commons, and that House had still five years to run. But Mr. Disraeli had no strong convictions, and Lord Derby, though impetuous and overbearing as an orator, is wanting in steady courage as a statesman. A trifling disturbance, hardly to be dignified with the name of a riot, in which about a hundred feet of the railings of Hyde Park were pushed down by the crowd, whether accidentally or by design nobody knows to this hour, so shook the nerves of "the Rupert of debate" that he immediately directed his lieutenant to prepare a measure of parliamentary reform. His lieutenant accordingly, with the assistance of the electioneering agents of the party, prepared a measure which was framed on the principle of ostensibly granting household suffrage, and thereby outbidding the Liberal leaders, but clogging the grant with such conditions as to leave the suffrage practically as restricted as it was before. The conditions, being unskilfully devised and too palpably tricky, broke down, one after another, in the progress of the bill through the House of Commons ; the most important of them, and the one declared by the government to be the cardinal principle of the bill, the personal payment of poor-rates, was framed in ignorance of the existing law, and evaporated as soon as it was called in question. And thus the Tory party found itself landed in an extension of the suffrage at least as wide as that which had been proposed by Mr. Bright, and

for proposing which Mr. Bright had been charged with the fell design of "Americanizing our institutions," besides incurring a ruinous loss of character in the process. This, probably, is the true history of the Tory Reform Bill. Mr. Disraeli, indeed, now avers, that, while he was denouncing Mr. Gladstone's limited measure as fraught with democracy and revolution, and its author as a new Tom Paine, and while he was securing the support of the Adullamites by assurances of inflexible resistance to reform, he himself meditated a far more extensive measure, and was "educating" his party up to that mark. But in this he probably does himself, according to our view of the relations between politics and morality, more or less than justice. He concurred with Lord Derby in offering a place in the cabinet to Mr. Lowe, the most sincere, uncompromising, and powerful of all the opponents of reform. This he would never have done, had he at the time made up his mind to propose household suffrage; for he must have known that he would have no chance of carrying Mr. Lowe with him, and that, upon his disclosing his intentions, Mr. Lowe would either become master of the cabinet, which from his power was quite possible, or break it up by his secession.

We have said, and we repeat, that in the course of these events a great amount of revolutionary sentiment has been developed in England. The cause of this sudden advance of political feeling was partly the discussion provoked by the rejection of Mr. Gladstone's Reform Bill, and the challenges which the opponents of that bill threw out with the most reckless insolence to the unenfranchised masses,—partly and principally the signal collapse of the political character of the governing class. A leading German periodical, *Unsere Zeit*, in its review of these events, spoke of the result as "a moral bankruptcy of the nation." It should have said, rather, a moral bankruptcy of the governing class of the nation: with that limitation, the remark was perfectly true. The absence of moral and political stamina in the wealthy and luxurious section of society, which had hitherto monopolized power, might be visible to the eye of a careful observer, but it had never been revealed to the nation before. The people found their claim to political rights one day met with the proudest and

coarsest rebuff, in spite of all that reason and justice could urge in its favor; the next day they found the same claim precipitately conceded, in fright at the gathering of a few open-air meetings of artisans, and at the demolition of some dilapidated park-railings. They felt at once that they were powerful and that they were not ruled by justice. The insulting language of the Tory aristocracy and their Adullamite allies in the debates of 1866 had hardly died on the workingman's ears, when he was summoned to the presence of the Tory leaders to be flattered and caressed, and told that his political virtue and intelligence — the political virtue and intelligence of "the ignorant, the impulsive, the drunken, and the corrupt" — were the great hope of the state. He saw the chiefs of the aristocracy, manifestly for the sake of office, dealing with the highest of all public interests in a manner which the Tory "Quarterly Review" compared to the fraudulent proceedings of a firm of commercial swindlers; and he saw the aristocracy at large cynically applauding this conduct, and exulting in the short-lived triumph to which it had led. He saw, moreover, the sovereign, a woman bereft of honest advisers, and stricken by an overwhelming sorrow, in the hands of adventurers, who were making use of her name for the purposes of their personal ambition. He saw the Established Church a tool in the same hands, and her prelates meeting under political influence to declare that her existence was bound up with that of the Irish Establishment, — an iniquity which was the scandal of Christendom. He saw these things with eyes cleared both by education and discussion as they had never been cleared before. The spell of ages has been broken, and in the nineteenth century spells once broken are not easily repaired. Nor could the traditional allegiance of the people to the unwritten constitution fail to receive a severe shock, when the great constitutional principle of government by the majority in Parliament was given to the winds, and a minority seized on the government, and maintained itself in power by appropriating the principles of its opponents.

The admission of the great artisan class to political power was, however, in itself enough to alter the complexion of English politics, and give a stimulus to the whole nation. The

artisans, if not positively revolutionary, are distinctly democratic. Excluded from the constitution long after they had become more than the equals in political intelligence of a large portion of those who were within its pale, they have formed their political character outside of it, and with little reverence for its consecrated names. They have also grown up, for the most part, in total estrangement from the Established Church, and indeed from all religious organizations, the opinions prevalent among them being mainly of the Secularist type. In their trades unions they have long waged an industrial war with the former masters of the state, and they naturally carry on their antagonism from the industrial to the political arena. They are active-minded, collected in large masses, and fitted in every respect to form the rank and file of a strong movement party. Their influence is already distinctly seen, both in the new positions taken up by public men, and in the progress of political questions in which the artisans are specially interested, especially those relating to trades unions and public education. As electors they are far more independent than the tradesmen, who cannot afford to offend their customers; whereas the skilled artisan, in a market where skilled labor is in great demand, is generally sure of employment, and can set his master at defiance. It was with good reason, therefore, that the Tories regarded with especial dread the enfranchisement of these men.

Moreover, the progress of the discussion has given even men who have no wish for organic change an insight into social dangers with which the present system of class government has proved itself unable to deal. An ordinary tourist in England, living at his hotel in the wealthy quarter of London, or visiting at the country seats of the nobility and gentry, sees nothing of the maladies and perils of English society. At one extreme of that society is colossal, almost fabulous wealth, — fortunes the amount of which surpasses the powers of enjoyment of any ten or any hundred human beings. At the other extreme is a mass of poverty and suffering, daily increasing, and as unparalleled in its magnitude as the wealth. While a Marquis of Westminster, a Lord Derby, or a Lord Overstone is drawing his million or two millions of dollars a



year, eleven hundred thousand persons are normally living in a state of penal pauperism ; several millions more, in fact the whole peasant population, are always within sight of the same state ; and if a peasant lives to old age, the workhouse or outdoor relief, administered under penal conditions, is not only his ordinary, but his almost certain doom. Close to the palaces of Belgrave Square and the sumptuous club-houses of Pall Mall lie tracts seldom visited by the stranger, but equal in extent to cities, which are the teeming abodes of ignorance, filth, and destitution. The other great cities of England exhibit a similar spectacle. In what condition, both in point of material comfort and of civilization, the mass of the Irish people are, no American needs to be told. Vagrants and mendicants, who are frequently also thieves, abound upon the public ways ; and in the metropolis the criminal part of the population has grown so strong, and so conscious of its own strength, that the police begin to cower, and outrage stalks the streets with impunity at midday. Close to the centre of civilization lie hordes of barbarians who know no law but force, to whom government is simply repressive, and whose uprising, if it ever in any special season of suffering or excitement should occur, would be as fearful as the invasion of an Attila. The artisans of the manufacturing districts stand of course on a very different level, and are much more a law to themselves ; but the state religion has wholly failed to reach them, and the ascendancy of the social over the selfish and sensual impulses in their character rests on a precarious foundation. The land of the nation, the distribution of which is the strongest guaranty for the loyalty of the people and the stability of the social fabric, is being rapidly engrossed by a small number of great proprietors ; the independent yeomanry, once the sinews of English strength and the pillars of English order and legality, have entirely disappeared ; and the nation will soon be a tenant at will on its own soil. Pedantic economists in England tell you, with perfect complacency, that these things are the natural result of certain economical causes. A physical malady is the natural result of certain physical causes, but, if neglected, it may be death. All thoughtful Englishmen are beginning to be sensible of these things, and to desire, on so-

cial grounds, and entirely apart from any merely theoretical preference for democratic institutions, a government national enough and strong enough to grapple with the peril in the interest of the whole community, and to divert the public resources and energies from waste and folly, from Caffir wars, Canadian fortifications, and Abyssinian expeditions, to the real and pressing needs of a suffering and imperilled nation.

If the new Parliament does not adequately reflect this change in the national sentiment, if it consists mainly of the same class of men as the old Parliament, with the same conservative or timid temper, there are explanations of this result. In the first place, though the franchise has been extended, large classes still remain unenfranchised. No votes have yet been given to the great class of agricultural laborers, who, though too ignorant and dull to have any definite political opinions, are certainly not well affected — as in truth they have little cause to be well affected — to the land-owners or their government. In the second place, the registration of the poorer voters, especially of those qualified as lodgers, has as yet been very imperfect, and large numbers of votes have thus been lost to the candidates of the workingmen. In the third place, the redistribution of seats under the late Reform Bill was merely illusory, as Lord Derby himself in fact admitted, and no proportion or pretence of proportion has yet been established between population and representation. In the fourth place, the enormous expense of contested elections to the candidates\* remains undiminished, or rather is increased, by the increase in the numbers of the constituencies; and the nominations are thus practically confined to the rich, or those who can raise large sums of money, which at once explains the failure of the workingmen to elect representatives of their own class. In the fifth place, the vote was not free; the land-owners, great and small, coerced their tenants at will, in pursuance, it seems, of a sort of feudal tradition, which makes them fancy, that, as the territorial aristocracy of the Middle Ages had a right to

---

\* A contested election for a county costs the candidate at least \$ 12,000. For a large borough, the expense, even supposing there is no bribery, is not much less, sometimes much greater. Local lawyers, who have got the constituencies into their hands, demand enormous fees as election agents. In one constituency a candidate was forced to pay fourteen of these agents \$ 500 apiece.

lead their tenants to the field, they have a right to lead their tenants to the poll. The special proclamations of a few liberal-minded landlords, that they would not interfere with the tenant's vote, only served to mark the general prevalence of the opposite practice; while, on the other side, there were amusingly frank avowals of the landlord's right to coerce, from several great proprietors, and among them from a lady, who, being abroad, transmitted to her agent a missive couched in the most curt and peremptory language, ordering her tenants on sight of it to vote for the candidate of her choice.\* The reformed Parliament, whatever may be the personal inclinations of its members, even if it can avoid extending the franchise beyond the present arbitrary line, can scarcely avoid making better provisions for the registration of voters, — redistributing the seats so as to establish a fair proportion between representation and population, — casting on the counties and municipalities, or at all events reducing, the expenses of elections, — and protecting the freedom of the voter by the ballot, and perhaps also by an act against intimidation. The party of progress will likewise be compelled to give itself the organization, for want of which, in a contest with a party far more compact and unanimous than itself, it lost, through double candida-

---

\* The Duke of Marlborough gave special scandal by allowing his agent to coerce voters on an estate which had been granted by the nation as a reward for the services of the Great Duke. The Duke of Portland, in a letter justifying his use of his influence as a land-owner, naïvely divided the community into two classes, — gentlemen, who might be believed on their honor, and common people, who could be believed only on their oath. "A Conservative Landlord," in a letter published in a leading Tory journal, expressed his belief that there was "one method, and one method only, by which Conservatives could triumph." Conservative landlords, he said, owned three fourths of the landed property of the country, and had three fourths of the expenditure in their hands. Let a list of tradesmen of Conservative and Church principles be made out, and let not a farthing be spent with any one else. This argument would bring "Liberals and freedom-of-conscience Dissenters" to their right minds. No doubt the writer of this letter would sing, "Rule, Britannia! Britons never will be slaves," with as stentorian a voice and in as perfect good faith as any one else. The Tories held scarcely any public meetings. Mr. Brodrick, the Liberal candidate for Woodstock, the Duke of Marlborough's borough, was able to say that his opponent, Mr. Barnett, shrank from any public appearance before the electors. The battle was fought on the Tory side almost entirely by private influence, and to a great extent through the pressure exercised by landlords on tenants at will and by customers on tradesmen.

tures and other violations of party discipline and good tactics, probably a score of seats. What is most important of all, the newly enfranchised masses have not as yet awakened to political life. Hitherto it has not been worth while to agitate them or address them through the press. Now that it is worth while, no doubt agitators and journalists will soon appear; and the people will become conscious of their power, and alive to the objects for which it may be used. The effect of the Reform Bill of 1832 was felt most at first, because the classes then enfranchised were already full of political activity; the complete effect of the Reform Bill of 1867 will not be felt for ten, perhaps not for twenty years.

Household suffrage was recommended by the Tory leaders to their startled and wavering followers, and perhaps was really preferred to a more limited measure by the leaders themselves, on the ground, that, while the enfranchisement of the more independent and intelligent portion of the workmen would be favorable to the party of progress, the enfranchisement of the lowest class of householders might be favorable to the party of reaction. The "instincts" of the lowest class, it was said, would be good, and they would be amenable to "legitimate influence." Thus a "Tory-Democrat" league was to be formed between the two extremes of society for the coercion of all the respectability and intelligence which lay between. The history of both hemispheres furnishes precedents for such a policy, but scarcely one for its open avowal. It has by no means proved abortive in these elections. Evidently, from the poorer quarters of some of the more retrograde cities, numbers of ignorant voters have been led, under the influence of drink, senseless cries, landlord coercion, and probably bribery, to vote for the taxation of their own tea and sugar to keep up the army which upholds by its bayonets the Church Establishment in Ireland. But though not actually abortive, the manœuvre on the whole has failed. The working class, in the main, has been true to its own leaders, its own interests, and its own hopes. At Sheffield, the scene of the great trades-union outrages, the Tory candidate appealed in the most unblushing manner to the extreme trades-unionists, and received the support of the murderer Broadhead and his

compeers ; but the more respectable societies carried the election of Mr. Mundella, a great employer of labor, noted at once for his strong Liberal opinions and for his beneficent efforts to put an end to industrial wars. In other places a similar game was played by Tory candidates, but with little effect. Morality, as well as Liberalism, must rejoice at this result.

Though wealth has asserted its unshaken supremacy and the new Parliament consists of the same men as the old, its members will have different constituencies behind them, and to some extent a different mission. This will be felt, if it is borne by the current of events into a more advanced position than the majority of the members at present contemplate. The majority of the members probably at present contemplate distinctly two great measures only, — the abolition of the Irish Church Establishment, which the nation has ratified by an overwhelming vote, and the institution of some general and effective system of popular education, which, since the extension of the franchise, has ceased to be a mere matter of philanthropic interest, and become a matter of life or death to the community. But the first of these measures is likely to bring the House of Commons into collision with the House of Lords, which has committed itself deeply to the maintenance of the Establishment, and both are likely to bring it into collision with the Established Church of England, the clergy of which have desperately identified their cause with that of the Established Church of Ireland, and have hitherto shown a fixed determination (which, assuming, as the institution of an Established Church manifestly assumes, that the religion endowed by the state is indisputably true, cannot be called unreasonable) to keep popular education in their own hands.

To the case of the Established Church I may return in a future article. In speaking of the House of Lords, I desire to guard myself against the imputation of any irrational hatred of aristocracy in the abstract. Aristocracy, like the paternal despotism of the head of a tribe, has had its place in history, and served certain purposes in the development of civilization. It is to be approved or condemned, not absolutely, but relatively to the state of a given nation ; and in any case full allowance is to be made for the trial to which the members of a privileged class

are subjected, when they are called upon to resign their privileges for the good of the community. Seldom, if ever, can men brought up under the influence of privilege possess the greatness of mind to acknowledge that the time of their order is come, and that the only service they can render to humanity is by smoothing the inevitable transition and linking the future amicably to the past.

The English House of Lords is now the only hereditary chamber in Europe. In one or two other countries, Prussia and Bavaria, for example, the upper chamber still contains an hereditary element, but always in combination with an element of election or nomination for life. In most countries the upper chamber is wholly elective or nominated for life, and the principle of election greatly prevails, on the whole, over that of nomination. The upper house of the Austrian Reichsrath contains no hereditary members except the princes of the Imperial family, — though, with regard to a certain number of places in the house, nobility, with a large landed estate, is a condition of nomination. England, which of all the great nations of Europe was the first to half emancipate herself from feudalism, satisfied with that half-emancipation, has now let the rest of the world go by her, and has remained to this time complacently in a semi-feudal state. But since the crash of last year all institutions have been put upon their trial by the nation; and in the court of free opinion the House of Lords cannot stand. The feudal baron of the Middle Ages performed, according to the exigencies and after the fashion of a semi-barbarous time, real and arduous functions for the community. He held his lands, not as private property, the revenue of which might be spent in a palace in London or in the pleasure cities of the Continent, but on condition of service, in war as a leader of the local militia, and in peace as a local maintainer of order and administrator of justice, at a period when the central government was very feeble, and there was no national police. He also represented, as a great land-owner, the only kind of property which, before the development of trade and manufactures, was of much consequence and held in high esteem. It was on these substantial grounds that he was called to the great council of the nation, not because he was his father's

son: for though the fiefs, in their origin grants to the individual, naturally and almost inevitably became hereditary, and carried their jurisdictions and political privileges with them, it may very safely be said that the idea of an hereditary legislature, such as the advocates of the House of Lords are now called upon to defend, never entered the feudal mind. Moreover, the House of Lords in the Middle Ages was only partly hereditary. Down to the Reformation the bishops and mitred abbots outnumbered the lay peers; and many of the bishops and abbots, even in the latter days of the mediæval Church, when Church patronage was most abused and Church elections were most corrupt, were men who had risen by a certain kind of merit from the ranks of the people. With such an institution the present House of Lords is identical in nothing except in name. It is simply a titled plutocracy of great land-owners, holding their estates, since the reign of Charles II., as private property, discharged of any public duties military or civil. It represents nothing but the estates of the great land-owners, and the interests and feelings of that class. Wealth in land is almost the sole title of admission to it: no man who is too poor to endow his heirs with a great landed estate for the support of the title, however high his public merits and distinctions, can find entrance into what is ironically called the Temple of Honor; while, on the other hand, no personal lack of merit and distinction will exclude a millionaire who has invested his fortune in broad acres and lent a steady support to a minister in the House of Commons. Even birth is disregarded, provided the essential condition of great wealth be fulfilled: peerages have been conferred, within a recent period, on two bastards, of whom one was wholly undistinguished, while the other was distinguished in a high degree by the exceeding irregularity of his life. Genius and virtue, without wealth, can be admitted, only if, as in the case of Lord Macaulay, they are childless. At the same time, the life element, formerly preponderant in the House, has been reduced by the suppression of the abbacies, and by the great increase in the number of lay peers, (the vast majority of whom, instead of being Normans, are of quite recent creation,) to comparative insignificance in point of number, and to almost total insignificance

in point of influence,—for the bishops are effectually warned off, if they attempt to encroach on any but ecclesiastical questions. The character of the great majority of the members of the House is such as it is the natural tendency of hereditary wealth and privilege to produce, when their influence is untempered by any necessity for self-exertion or any training in the school of active duty. They are for the most part men living a life of ease and pleasure, rather below than above the average of the upper classes in education and intelligence, and so little interested in public affairs, or willing to sacrifice personal enjoyment to public obligations, that the smallness of the attendance in the House of Lords, even on important occasions, has become a scandal and a source of alarm to the leaders of the order, and efforts have recently been made to induce the peers to attend in more respectable numbers, though hitherto without much effect.

In the Middle Ages, the barons, standing on a real political and social necessity of the time, and feeling the ground firm under their feet, were not timid reactionists, but rather in their narrow way ministers of progress: they carried the Great Charter; they founded the House of Commons; they set limits to the power of the Church; they acted as the pioneers and trustees of liberties which were in the course of time to become the liberties of the people. But the plutocracy which is now invested with their titles has, for the last century and a half at least, been a mere organ of reaction, and of the timorous sensibility of a privileged class, whose privileges are threatened, immediately or remotely, by every measure of change. The House of Lords originates nothing of importance, not even on those neutral subjects on which, if it were really worthy of the name of a senate, it might usefully and acceptably initiate legislation. It does nothing but veto; and its veto has been put indiscriminately on every kind of innovation, even on the best considered and most inevitable reforms,—on the extension of the *habeas corpus*, the mitigation of the penal code, the abolition of the slave-trade, the admission of Jews to Parliament, the admission of Dissenters to the Universities, the repeal of the paper tax which prevented the development of a cheap press, as well as on the Reform Act of 1832, and the abolition of



the rotten boroughs. Its obstructiveness has been limited only by its fears. It dared not, in the midst of famine and fierce agitation, veto the repeal of the Corn Laws; and in the case of the late Reform Bill, the leaders of the aristocratic party, in a sudden panic, had struck their flag. Rational and far-sighted Conservatives, as well as Radicals, may well doubt, and we believe are beginning to doubt, whether such an institution can, without considerable modification, satisfy the needs of society in the future, and whether the infusion at least of a large element of life peers is not necessary to make the upper chamber anything but a source of danger to the Constitution.

It is evident that the position of the House of Lords has been greatly altered by the recent extension of the suffrage. While the House of Commons represented only a mere fraction of the nation, the House of Lords, though representing a still narrower class, might sometimes with impunity assert its independent power. But when the House of Commons represents the nation, as it now does, or will soon do, the result of a collision between the two houses cannot be doubtful, especially if the question on which the collision takes place is one on which the mind of the nation is decidedly made up. Such a question is the question of the Irish Church: for the English people are now heartily sick of the Irish difficulty, and have resolutely determined to put an end to it, if they can, and at all events to show the world that its continuance is no fault of theirs.

This, however, is not the only point on which a collision, possibly resulting in a conflict between the two houses, may occur. Great dissatisfaction is felt, especially among the legal profession, with the constitution of the House of Lords as the ultimate court of appeal, — an incongruous function which this political assembly derives from a rude age, when law did not exist as a science or a regular profession, and when political and judicial powers were everywhere vested in the same hands. To meet this dissatisfaction, Lord Palmerston, assuredly in no revolutionary spirit, proposed, in the exercise of an ancient and well-attested prerogative of the crown, to confer on an eminent lawyer a peerage for life; but the House of Lords, under the inspiration of Lord Derby, desperately resisted the attempt, and asserted the exclusively hereditary character of the House,

exemplifying thereby an old lesson of history, which teaches that institutions and privileged orders doomed to abolition will never hear of compromise till it is too late. By denying the sovereign's prerogative of appointing peers for life, the Lords have rendered indispensable an act of Parliament to confer the power: to that act the House of Commons must be a party; and, in the present temper of the nation, it will be impossible for the House of Commons to confine the power to the case of law peers.

Again, the existence of a landed aristocracy is inseparably bound up with primogeniture and entail,\* upon the abolition of which experience shows that the great estates of the nobility would melt away. But the monopoly of land, which primogeniture and entail promote, and which is every day growing narrower, has become, as we have said, already a subject of serious discussion, not only on economical and social, but on political grounds. If Mr. Bright is a member of the new Cabinet, (a member of the new Cabinet, if he chooses, he must be,) the ministry will contain a pledged and powerful advocate of land-law reform, one whose opinions on this most critical question were but recently denounced with frantic violence by that eminent organ of wealth and its privileges, the London "Times." If the evils and dangers of the present system are great in the case of England, they are still greater in the case of Ireland, where it involves not only excessive aggregation of land and divorce of the mass of the people from the soil, but absenteeism: many great Irish estates being entailed with estates in England, where the proprietors almost always reside. The use made by the great landlords of their territorial influence in the coercion of voters at the late elections is not unlikely to make the cup of discontent overflow; but at all events the formidable question of primogeniture and entail is

---

\* Primogeniture is legally operative only in cases of intestacy, which do not often occur; but the law of primogeniture leads the custom. Instead of *entail*, we should, in legal strictness, say *settlement*; for it is by family settlements, renewed on the marriage of each eldest son, not by entails of the ancient kind, that the estates of the nobility are held together. English reformers do not desire to adopt the French law of compulsory division. They only desire to place real estate, in case of intestacy, on the same footing as personal, and to prohibit the tying up of land to persons unborn. The testamentary power they would leave unfettered, as at present.

far nearer to a practical issue in England than those who have not been in the country within the last two or three years are aware.

Thus, without any clear and settled determination to abolish or alter the House of Peers, the nation may find itself actually confronting that institution in the path of necessary progress ; and in that case the national mind is now prepared theoretically for a large measure of change.

The monarchy is threatened not so much in itself as through the cognate institutions, the House of Lords and the Established Church, the fall of which it could scarcely survive. A few years ago we should have said that in itself it was in no peril whatever, except in so far as its fate was foreshadowed by the fall of the kindred European dynasties, which have been replaced by monarchies more or less democratic in their origin and character, and evidently destined to stand merely as provisional dictatorships between the monarchical past and the democratic future. But since the retirement of the Queen from public and social life, under the pressure of affliction, and the cessation of drawing-rooms and court balls, the classes whose lip-loyalty was before the loudest, the fashionable world and the London tradesmen, have betrayed the hollowness of their sentiment by a very free use of language for which they would have proposed to hang a member of the Reform League. Pasquinades have been posted on the gates of Buckingham Palace. The most scandalous allusions to Widowed Majesty have been seen in "Punch," side by side with flunkyish sneers at the American Republic and laudations of Governor Eyre. One member of Parliament, a London house-agent, went so far as to suggest in the House of Commons, that, as the Queen could not perform the duties of her station by giving parties and keeping up the rent of London houses, she should be requested to abdicate ; and though the House of Commons received the suggestion with loud denunciations of horror, the member in question probably found encouragement and applause elsewhere. In this feeling the serious part of the nation does not share ; and when it was expressed in presence of Mr. Bright, it drew from him a crushing rebuke. But the serious part of the nation has been led of late to reflect on the latent dangers of

monarchy, however constitutionalized, by the introduction of the Queen's name into the controversy about the Irish Church, and the attempt, feeble perhaps, but unmistakable, which the late prime minister, stimulated no doubt by the contagious example of the French Empire, made to revive personal government in his own interest. More speculative thinkers have begun openly to question the value of the whole system of constitutional fiction of which England has so long boasted as the masterpiece of practical wisdom, and of the central fiction among the others, and, to proclaim, that, for the future, society can rest securely only on realities. Much depends on the personal character of the wearers of the crown. The remark is constantly heard, and it is no doubt true, that the nation would not bear another George IV. But without giving credit to the stories about the present heir to the crown, of which three fourths at least may safely be set down as the mere creations of a malignant fancy, we may be perfectly sure that in the course of nature another George IV. will come. Take a series of men of average intellect and character, (and George IV. was probably at least up to the average naturally in both,) guard them by a fence of royal etiquette against all the wholesome influences which produce and sustain virtue in other men, deny them the training of necessary self-exertion, of fair criticism, of equal friendship, expose them to every possible temptation, surround them with parasites, supply them with the means of gratifying every passion, and you are morally sure within a limited number of generations to produce a scandalous debauchee. Even in the Middle Ages, when kings were trained in a far rougher and hardier school, an Edward I. was followed by an Edward II., and Edward III. by a Richard II. In those days, when nobody dreamed of any government but a monarchy, the individual monarch met his doom: in these days the monarchy might fall.

At present there is no Republican party; probably the most advanced Radical would disclaim the name of Republican. But there is a good deal of Republican sentiment; and if things hold on their present course, the natal hour of the Republican party is not far distant. This we believe to be the fact; and it will not appear very incredible, when we consider that there

is undoubtedly a strong Republican party in Spain, and that the Spanish Republicans have been a good deal educated by the writings of English politicians. When the Republican party in England is born, it will not die; for this time the Commonwealth will not be the premature aspiration of a group of advanced theorists like Vane and Milton: it will come in the fulness of time, and as the moral and political necessity of the whole nation.

Sober writers on politics, while they note tendencies and predict the ultimate issue with confidence, will avoid committing themselves to dates. A hundred accidents beyond the range of mortal foresight may accelerate or retard the English revolution. The power of wealth is a retarding influence, the force of which would be great anywhere, and overwhelming in so wealth-worshipping and wealth-ridden a country as England, if wealth were not generally too timorous to make an effective use of its power. Much will depend on the turn which political affairs may take in other countries; for England, in spite of her physical and moral insularity, becomes daily more bound up, to the great benefit of her political character, with the destinies of the sister nations which are like herself treading with faltering and stumbling steps the dangerous path that leads from the feudalism and privilege of the past to the rational and equitable institutions of the future. The collapse of the American Republic would, in the judgment of leading English Liberals, have put back the political progress of England for many years. Much will also depend on the appearance or non-appearance on the side of progress of gifted men, combining clearness of political vision with practical force and sagacity; and no positive philosopher has yet enabled us to foresee from hour to hour whether such men will appear or not, though, when they do appear, they greatly influence, maulre all philosophies, the destinies of nations and of mankind.

We assume that all will go on peaceably and constitutionally, and that every question will be decided by the vote of Parliament or at the polls. Perhaps, to make our view of the situation complete, we ought to notice the possibility of less favorable contingencies. We have already said that beneath the foundations of civilized society in England there lies a great mass

of barbarism, which is merely held down by force, and which might, like the Faubourg St. Antoine, in some sudden access of furious anguish, wild hope, or mere predatory violence, overpower its keepers and precipitate the march of events through anarchy into some form of reactionary despotism. On the other hand, there is a standing army, similar in kind to those which have formed the instruments of reactionary governments for the suppression of liberty in France and other countries, though smaller in size, owing to the happy exemption of the island kingdom from the necessity of defending military frontiers. To the direct command of this army the Court has always instinctively clung, repelling all attempts to turn the Horse Guards into a constitutional department. A large proportion of the troops has served in India and other dependencies, where it has been employed in holding down subject races, — a training very subversive of respect for public liberty and of the sentiments of a citizen. The officers, many of them drawn from the aristocracy, and all of them imbued with its spirit, would probably execute with exultation an order to commence the work of forcible repression. Whether the private soldiers would obey discipline or their own interests and their natural sympathies is a question which we believe no Englishman has ever thought of asking himself, — so serenely do they all take it for granted that the fate of other nations cannot possibly be theirs, and that soldiers steeped in the blood of Indian Sepoys and Jamaica peasants will in England always be the servants of the law. That the idea of using force to maintain what Privilege deems order has floated about in certain regions of English society, though it has probably never taken a definite form, we have reason at least to surmise. When something disagreeable is hatching against a community and the shrewder plotters keep their secret to themselves, Providence sometimes warns the community of its peril by such a monitor as Mr. Carlyle. Mr. Carlyle's oracular utterance in favor of the Slave Power showed us the bottom of his philosophy, and probably cured some of us of the habit of canting in Carlyle against cant, and shamming abhorrence of shams. In his recent pamphlet on the Reform Bill the philosopher of the celestial immensities and infinities exhibits himself

in a state of rather terrestrial panic, clinging to the knees of wealth and power for protection against the democracy, and praying for the maintenance of a Christian Church to guard a free-thinker's spoons. After a eulogy on the superior manners of the nobility, suggestive of recent intercourse with them, he proceeds to develop a plan for ostensibly accepting democracy and secretly preparing to smite it with the sword. The plan may be confidently pronounced to be his own; but the spirit embodied in it may be that of the company which he has been keeping. We may add, that the language used by the partisans of Governor Eyre was not applicable only to the maintenance of order in dependencies. Upstart wealth especially is all for arbitrary and sanguinary measures,—more so than the old aristocracy, on which constitutional traditions press with greater weight. Fortunately, however, for England, her citizens have almost adamant barriers of habit and sentiment to break through before they can resort to force on either side. This comparative immunity from any tendency to violence, the result partly of the Anglo-Saxon character, partly of the happy accidents of English history, is the great advantage which England possesses over her sister nations, and the great reason for looking to her rather than to any of the rest for the ultimate solution of the tremendous problem of political reconstruction which Providence in this age has set before them all.

Meantime the present electoral triumph of the Liberal party, assuring it a pledged majority in a division on Mr. Gladstone's resolutions of not less than one hundred, ought to leave no doubt of its success on the issue taken at the polls respecting the disestablishment of the Irish Church. The majority includes some men of whom the Liberal leaders would probably be glad to be rid, whom they would be glad even to see transferred to the Tory side, as they would rather see a plank added to the enemy's ship than the dry-rot in their own. But as matters appear at the time of writing this, severe and decisive lessons have been given by the Liberal constituencies to secessionists and mutineers. Mr. Horsman has paid the penalty of what his enemies style his wayward egotism and he styles his independence; and Americans, and moral and civilized

beings generally, may note with pleasure the ejection of Mr. Roebuck, rendered more piquant by the supplications to which that paragon of political insolence and outrage descended, when he found himself in serious peril. Whether the majority will long hold together, when the resolution for disestablishing the Irish Church has been reaffirmed, is a more doubtful question. It includes a number of aristocratic Whigs, Liberal on certain questions, such as public education, the opening of the Universities, and free trade, and generally disposed to go as far as they can rather than give up their hold upon the movement party, but separated by a great gulf of sentiment from the Democratic wing. The question of primogeniture and entail especially would put a terrible strain on the alliance, and we have expressed our conviction that this question must soon arise. Personal feelings will probably for the present keep the Whigs to their colors. Lord Derby, who in the autumn of political life throws stones with the vernal levity of a schoolboy, took pains both in public and in private to make it known that his great object in carrying his Reform Bill was to "dish the Whigs," and that the discomfiture of those grandees, whom he hates with the bitterness of a former friend and associate, more than made up to him for any peril in which his policy might involve the country. As to Mr. Disraeli, the same reasons which led the more independent members of the Tory cabinet to separate from him would prevent the Whigs from joining him. But if Lord Salisbury, a man whose character, as well as whose ability, is universally respected, were to become the leader of the Tory party, it is probable that he would attract Whig support. The great deterrent would be the fear of the Whig nobles, lest, if all the aristocracy were on one side, all the people might be on the other. For the English aristocracy has hitherto been led by its instincts, or, as Darwinians would say, trained by the struggle for political existence, to follow the policy of the Scotch lairds, who in times of civil war, to avoid the forfeiture of their property, took care to have the father out upon one side and the son upon the other.

Whether Mr. Gladstone will be a successful prime minister of England is a question on which the uninspired must sus-



pend their judgment. He was brought up in an unfortunate school, political and ecclesiastical, the trammels of which have hitherto hung about him; and we shall now see whether he has force enough finally to cast them off, and to fulfil the expectations of the people. When we are told that he is not a good tactician, we feel rather like King George II., who, on being told by an enemy of General Wolfe that the General was mad, answered, "Then I wish he would bite every officer in my army." A politician who is not a good tactician is the very man for whom society has long been looking out with its lantern in its hand. But to say that a party leader is wanting in generalship, when he has just forced his opponents to accept decisive battle on a field of his own choosing, and there given them a disastrous overthrow, is surely to divest the phrase of any practical meaning. The criticisms on General Grant's generalship were numerous and acute; but the less discerning public was satisfied when he marched into Richmond. Thus much, at all events, the recent elections have made clear beyond the possibility of doubt, — that to be governed by Mr. Gladstone is the object, not only of desire, but of fervent and almost passionate desire, among the great mass of the English people. This is a fact compared with which the supercilious sneers of paper strategists and cynical Epicureans appear to us, we confess, of exceedingly little importance. It is also a fact highly creditable to the English people, and especially to the artisans, whose loyalty to Mr. Gladstone has been most ardent and conspicuous. For, whatever Mr. Gladstone may prove to be, it is certain that what the artisans take him to be is not a demagogue of the type which their friends feared and their enemies hoped they might prefer, but a really high-minded and patriotic statesman, uniting singular cultivation to warm popular sympathies, and bent on governing for the good of the whole nation. Whether they are right or wrong in their belief, their choice of such a leader is a happy opening of their political existence, and a good omen for their future use of power. They have laid a very serious responsibility on the object of their choice; for, if he disappoints them, their bitterness of heart will be proportioned to the warmth of their present affection and the strength of their present hopes.

Another gratifying feature of the elections was the total failure of the No-Popery cry raised by the Tory government to excite in its own favor the religious passions of the people. A certain number of the clergy were perhaps stimulated to more apocalyptic violence of language ; to make them stronger Tories than they were would have been impossible. A fanatic or impostor named Murphy, who went about in the interest of the government, delivering slanderous lectures against the Roman Catholic religion in towns where there was a mixed English and Irish population, succeeded in producing several riots, and possibly one or two seats may have been carried by the anti-Catholic and anti-Irish rancor which he excited ; but on the whole, this attempt to raise the evil spirits of the religious past proved an anachronism, as well as an offence against morality doubly grave when committed by a government. Scarcely a bosom fluttered at the premier's awful pictures of the approaching absorption of the whole religious universe by the power which at that very moment was losing the kingdom of Philip II., and which was held on its own throne at Rome only by the bayonets of free-thinkers. The declaration that the Protestant religion could not subsist for an hour without the support of the royal supremacy was received by the English with the disgust of men who, having, for practical reasons, long held and wishing still to hold a questionable doctrine in solution, see it suddenly precipitated in the form of a repulsive absurdity ; by the Scotch, who were left out of sight in these manifestoes, it was received as rank blasphemy. In the three generations which have passed since the Lord George Gordon riots reason and charity have made some progress.

That they have progress still to make is shown, on the other hand, by the rejection of Mr. Mill at Westminster, mainly in consequence of a religious prejudice which had been raised against him, and to which he lent some color at a critical moment by his uncalculating act of moral chivalry in subscribing to the election expenses of the iconoclast, Bradlaugh. In the heart of no living man is the religious sentiment, whether in its element of reverence or of duty, stronger than in the heart of Mr. Mill ; but there is reason to suspect that his intellect is the inflexible and incorruptible servant of the truth. The

requisition to an obscure and commonplace, but orthodox millionaire, to come forward and oust with his long purse the "atheist" who refused to prostitute religious professions to the purchase of political support, was headed by Mr. Disraeli, who is now the Defender of the Faith, and was signed by a long train of minor defenders, as to many of whom it might pretty confidently be said that nothing deserving the name of a religious thought or emotion had ever entered into their minds or hearts, and that it was a mere accident of birthplace that they were bawling, slandering, and persecuting in the name of Jesus, and not in that of Mahomet, Buddha, or the Hindoo Pantheon.

The resolute initiation by the British nation and Parliament of a policy which promises to remove the reasonable grievances of Ireland, and to stanch the sources of Irish misery and barbarism, is a matter of interest to Americans as well as to Englishmen. The disestablishment of the Irish Church will not of itself restore peace and contentment in Ireland; the land question, in some form, must come; and perhaps behind both may lie the question of Irish nationality. But the principle of perfect equity has been affirmed as the ruling principle of Irish policy for the future; and no one but a disunionist (which it is of course childish to expect British citizens to be) can reasonably object to the language held or the ground taken up by Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Bright, and the other leaders of the Liberal party. It seems that in the late struggle the Liberals of Ireland have acted cordially with those of England. Had they been able to bring their minds to do this long ago, instead of sacrificing the interests of their own country to those of the Neapolitan Bourbons and the ecclesiastical rulers of Rome, their national grievances would not have waited for redress till now. The dawn, however, has come at last upon that long night of injustice and calamity; and no one, in whose heart hatred of England does not prevail over the love of humanity, will wish that it should be overcast again.

GOLDWIN SMITH.